



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,031	04/08/2004	Tsuyoshi Kawabe	500.43749X00	7583

24956 7590 02/21/2008
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD
SUITE 370
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

HANCE, ROBERT J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

4134

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/21/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/820,031	Applicant(s) KAWABE ET AL.	
	Examiner ROBERT HANCE	Art Unit 4134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/08/2004; 10/10/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe, US Patent No. 6,970,183, in view of Onuma et al., Japan Pub. No. JP 2001167365.

As to claim 1, Monroe discloses a video distribution system connected to a communication network for distributing an image (Abstract; Fig. 2), comprising:

at least one image pickup unit for picking up an image of a predetermined monitor area and converting said image into a video signal (Fig. 1 20, 22 are video cameras; Col. 16 lines 64-66);

at least one encoder connected to receive the video signal from said image pickup unit, each encoder encoding the video signal from an associated image pickup unit and sending the encoded video signal to said network (col. 19 lines 34-45);

an image accumulation and distribution unit connected to said network for accumulating the encoded video signal from a designated encoder (Fig. 3; col. 17 line 59 – col. 18 line 15), said image accumulation and distribution unit attaching unique

Art Unit: 4134

information to each image frame (col. 6 line 62 – col. 7 line 4 - all collected data is stamped with a chronology signal);

a data converter connected to said network for reading the accumulated image from said image accumulation and distribution unit and converting said image into a reduced image (col. 19 lines 34-45);

at least one information terminal connected by wire or radio to said network for acquiring and displaying an image by accessing said image accumulation and distribution unit or said data converter (Fig. 3 44 is a PDA; col. 8 lines 34-50; col. 17 lines 48-56); and

a notification unit connected to said network for reading the accumulated image from said image accumulation and distribution unit, detecting an image change indicating an abnormality in said predetermined monitor area (Fig. 34; col. 25 lines 59-64 – DSP 134 performs motion detection on image frames from camera 70) and displaying alarm information containing a change occurrence time on an associated information terminal (col. 7 lines 46-60; col. 6 line 62 – col. 7 line 4 – audio and/or video and/or image and/or sensor data is sent to monitor station upon event detection. This data is time-stamped; col. 8 lines 39-48 – collected data (which can include time stamps) is displayed on portable display units),

wherein said associated information terminal accesses said image accumulation and distribution unit or said data converter and acquires the image in a predetermined time range related to said change occurrence time from said image accumulation and

distribution unit or said data converter (col. 28 lines 2-7 – video data from a time just prior to event detection (i.e. a predetermined time) is sent to the network).

Monroe fails to explicitly disclose distributing an image in response to an operation of said associated information terminal by a user. However, Onuma et al. disclose distributing an image in response to an operation of a user of an information terminal in a networked security system (Abstract; Paragraph 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Onuma et al. with the security system of Monroe. The rationale for this combination would have been to await user input before sending video data. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As to claim 2, Monroe discloses a video distribution system according to Claim 1, wherein said associated information terminal displays in a display section thereof said alarm information including at least said image change occurrence time and said image as of said change occurrence time (col. 15 lines 59-61 – video is routed to PDA monitor stations; Fig. 3: 44 is a PDA; Fig. 24 shows detail of PDA; col. 6 line 62 – col. 7 line 4 – all data collected is time-stamped; col. 17 lines 14-22 – monitoring station (PDA) receives data upon event detection, thus the image as of change occurrence time is

received and displayed; col. 8 lines 39-48 – collected data (which can include time stamps) is displayed on portable display units).

Monroe fails to disclose a symbol allowing the user of said associated information terminal user to select whether said image in said predetermined time range continues to be reproduced or not. However, Onuma et al. disclose prompting a user of a portable monitoring terminal to press a button to view an image of as of a change occurrence, and displaying this image (Paragraph 64). The user is then able to navigate through the images via symbols on a menu (Paragraph 64; Image 6: 53 is a navigation menu).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Onuma et al. with the security system of Monroe. The rationale for this combination would have been to await user input before sending video data. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As to claim 4, Monroe discloses a video distribution system according to Claim 1, wherein said associated information terminal acquires said image in said predetermined time range from said data converter and displays said image in dynamic image mode in the display section of said associated information terminal (col. 16 lines

58-67; col. 17 lines 59-63; col. 28 lines 2-7 – video data (i.e. dynamic image data) from a time just prior to event detection (i.e. a predetermined time) is sent to the network).

As to claim 5, Monroe discloses a video distribution system according to Claim 1, wherein said associated information terminal acquires the image in said predetermined time range from said data converter and displays said image, frame by frame, in the display section of said information terminal (col. 10 lines 13-15).

Monroe fails to explicitly disclose displaying an image in response to a request of the user of said associated information terminal. However, Onuma et al. disclose distributing an image in response to an operation of a user of an information terminal in a networked security system (Paragraph 64).

As to claim 6, Monroe discloses a video distribution system according to Claim 1, wherein said at least one information terminal includes at least one portable terminal and at least one client personal computer (PC) (Fig. 3; col. 17 lines 48-56 - PDA is used as an adjunct to base monitor station).

As to claim 7, Monroe discloses a video distribution system according to Claim 2, wherein said user is caused to input at least information for specifying said associated information terminal user (col. 23 lines 23-54 – portable video monitor has a fingerprint scanner that can be used for identification purposes) and an address of said notification unit (col. 3 lines 40-63 – the system preferably uses internet, which would be

obvious to one skilled in the art to require than an address of the base monitor station be entered into the portable video monitor)

Monroe fails to disclose acting in response to selection of continued reproduction by said user. However, Onuma et al. disclose distributing an image in response to an operation of a user of an information terminal in a networked security system (Paragraph 64).

Monroe fails to disclose a field on the display for entering ID and address information. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use such a field on the screen of a PDA to prompt a user to enter information.

As to claim 9, Monroe discloses a video distribution system connected to a communication network for distributing an image (Abstract; Fig. 2), comprising:

at least one image pickup unit for picking up an image of a predetermined area and converting said image into a video signal (Fig. 1 20, 22 are video cameras; Col. 16 lines 64-66);

at least one encoder connected to receive a video signal from said image pickup unit, each encoder encoding the video signal from an associated image pickup unit and sending the encoded video signal to said network (col. 19 lines 34-45);

an image accumulation and distribution unit connected to said network for accumulating the encoded video signal from a designated encoder (Fig. 3; col. 17 line

Art Unit: 4134

59 – col. 18 line 15), said image accumulation and distribution unit attaching unique information to each image frame (col. 6 line 62 – col. 7 line 4 - all collected data is stamped with a chronology signal);

a data converter connected to said network for reading the accumulated image from said image accumulation and distribution unit and converting said image into a reduced image (col. 19 lines 34-45);

at least one information terminal connected by wire or radio to said network for acquiring and displaying an image by accessing said image accumulation and distribution unit or said data converter (Fig. 3 44 is a PDA; col. 17 lines 48-56);

a sensor arranged in each monitor area of a plurality of monitor areas for detecting an abnormality in said monitor area (col. 6 lines 9-20); and

a notification unit connected to said network for reading the accumulated image from said image accumulation and distribution unit, detecting an image change indicating an abnormality in said predetermined monitor area (Fig. 34; col. 25 lines 59-64 – DSP 134 performs motion detection on image frames from camera 70) and displaying alarm information containing a change occurrence time on an associated information terminal (col. 7 lines 46-60; col. 6 line 62 – col. 7 line 4 – audio and/or video and/or image and/or sensor data is sent to monitor station upon event detection. This data is time-stamped; col. 8 lines 39-48 – collected data (which can include time stamps) is displayed on portable display units),

wherein said associated information terminal accesses said image accumulation and distribution unit or said data converter and acquires the image in a predetermined

time range related to said change occurrence time from said image accumulation and distribution unit or said data converter (col. 28 lines 2-7 – video data from a time just prior to event detection (i.e. a predetermined time) is sent to the network).

Monroe fails to explicitly disclose distributing an image in response to an operation of said associated information terminal by a user. However, Onuma et al. disclose distributing an image in response to an operation of a user of an information terminal in a networked security system (Abstract; Paragraph 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Onuma et al. with the security system of Monroe. The rationale for this combination would have been to await user input before sending video data. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As to claim 10, Monroe discloses a video distribution system according to Claim 9, wherein said associated information terminal displays in a display section thereof said alarm information including at least said image change occurrence time and said image as of said change occurrence time (col. 15 lines 59-61 – video is routed to PDA monitor stations; Fig. 3: 44 is a PDA; Fig. 24 shows detail of PDA; col. 6 line 62 – col. 7 line 4 – all data collected is time-stamped; col. 17 lines 14-22 – monitoring station (PDA) receives data upon event detection, thus the image as of change occurrence time is

received and displayed; col. 8 lines 39-48 – collected data (which can include time stamps) is displayed on portable display units).

Monroe fails to disclose a symbol allowing the user of said associated information terminal user to select whether said image in said predetermined time range continues to be reproduced or not. However, Onuma et al. disclose prompting a user of a portable monitoring terminal to press a button to view an image of as of a change occurrence, and displaying this image (Paragraph 64). The user is then able to navigate through the images via symbols on a menu (Paragraph 64; Image 6: 53 is a navigation menu).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Onuma et al. with the security system of Monroe. The rationale for this combination would have been to await user input before sending video data. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As to claim 12, Monroe discloses a video distribution system according to Claim 9, wherein said associated information terminal acquires said image in said predetermined time range from said data converter and displays said image in dynamic image mode in the display section of said associated information terminal (col. 16 lines

58-67; col. 17 lines 59-63; col. 28 lines 2-7 – video data from a time just prior to event detection (i.e. a predetermined time) is sent to the network).

As to claim 13, Monroe discloses a video distribution system according to Claim 9, wherein said associated information terminal acquires the image in said predetermined time range from said data converter and displays said image, frame by frame, in the display section of said information terminal (col. 10 lines 13-15).

Monroe fails to explicitly disclose displaying an image in response to a request of the user of said associated information terminal. However, Onuma et al. disclose distributing an image in response to an operation of a user of an information terminal in a networked security system (Paragraph 64).

As to claim 14, Monroe discloses a video distribution system according to Claim 9, wherein said at least one information terminal includes at least one portable terminal and at least one client personal computer (PC) (Fig. 3; col. 17 lines 48-56 - PDA is used as an adjunct to base monitor station).

As to claim 15, Monroe discloses a video distribution system according to Claim 2, wherein said user is caused to input at least information for specifying said associated information terminal user (col. 23 lines 23-54 – portable video monitor has a fingerprint scanner that can be used for identification purposes) and an address of said notification unit (col. 3 lines 40-48 – the system can use WLAN or internet, which would

have been obvious to one skilled in the art that an address of the base monitor station need be entered into the portable video monitor)

Monroe fails to disclose acting in response to selection of continued reproduction by said user. However, Onuma et al. disclose distributing an image in response to an operation of a user of an information terminal in a networked security system (Paragraph 64).

Monroe fails to disclose a field on the display for entering ID and address information. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use such a field on the screen of a PDA to prompt a user to enter information.

As to claim 17, Monroe discloses a video distribution method for a video distribution system connected to a communication network for distributing an image (Abstract; Fig. 2), comprising the steps of:

accumulating a video signal of at least one monitor area in an image accumulation and distribution unit through said network (Fig. 3; col. 17 line 59 – col. 18 line 15), wherein said video signal has attached thereto information unique to each image frame (col. 6 line 62 – col. 7 line 4 - all collected data is stamped with a chronology signal);

reading an image for each of a plurality of channels from said image accumulation and distribution unit through said network (col. 17 lines 59-63 - central server processes data from all sensors);

detecting an image change indicating an abnormality in an associated monitor area from said image read out (col. 25 lines 59-64), producing alarm information containing a change occurrence time (col. 6 line 62 – col. 7 line 4 - all collected data is stamped with a chronology signal) and a still image of said change occurrence time (col. 17 lines 14-22 – monitoring station receives data upon event detection, thus the image as of change occurrence time is received and displayed), and transmitting said alarm information to an associated information terminal through said network (col. 31 lines 17-24 – alarm conditions and sensor data is sent to remote monitors);

displaying said alarm information on said associated information terminal (col. 31 lines 17-36);

acquiring said image in a predetermined time range related to said change occurrence time from said image accumulation and distribution unit or a data converter (col. 28 lines 2-7 – video data from a time just prior to event detection (i.e. a predetermined time) is sent to the network); and

displaying said image in said predetermined time range in a display unit of said associated information terminal (Fig. 3 44 is a PDA; col. 8 lines 34-50; col. 17 lines 48-56).

Monroe fails to explicitly disclose distributing an image in response to an operation of said associated information terminal by a user. However, Onuma et al. disclose distributing an image in response to an operation of a user of an information terminal in a networked security system (Abstract; Paragraph 64).

As to claim 19, Monroe discloses an information terminal for use in a video distribution system which includes an image pickup unit, an image accumulation unit and a notification unit (Fig. 3; col. 17 line 48 - col. 18 line 11), said information terminal comprising:

a display for displaying an image picked up by said image pickup unit (col. 8 lines 39-48); and at least one decision button (col. 23 lines 23-37; Fig. 24), wherein said information terminal displays an image change indicating an abnormality detected by said notification unit based on image data accumulated in said image accumulation unit from said image pickup unit (col. 17 lines 14-22), and acquires image data of a predetermined time range from said image accumulation unit based on a change occurrence time related to said image change detected by said notification unit (col. 28 lines 2-7 – video data from a time just prior to event detection (i.e. a predetermined time) is sent to the device)

Monroe fails to disclose acting in response to an operation of said at least one decision button by a user. However, Onuma discloses obtaining sensor data in response to a user pressing a decision button on a portable monitoring station (Paragraph 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Onuma et al. with the security system of Monroe. The rationale for this combination would have been to await user input before sending video data. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in

their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As to claim 20, Monroe discloses an information terminal according to claim 19, wherein said information terminal displays in a display section thereof alarm information including at least said change occurrence time, an image as of said change occurrence time (col. 7 lines 46-60; col. 6 line 62 – col. 7 line 4 – audio and/or video and/or image and/or sensor data is sent to monitor station upon event detection. This data is time-stamped; col. 8 lines 39-48 – collected data (which can include time stamps) is displayed on portable display units),

Monroe fails to disclose a symbol allowing the user to select whether an image continues to be reproduced or not. However, Onuma et al. disclose prompting a user of a portable monitoring terminal to press a button to view an image of as of a change occurrence, and displaying this image (Paragraph 64). The user is then able to navigate through the images via symbols on a menu (Paragraph 64; Image 6: 53 is a navigation menu).

As to claim 22, Monroe discloses an information terminal according to Claim 19, wherein said information terminal acquires said image in said predetermined time range from a data converter which reads the accumulated image from said accumulation unit and converts said image into a reduced image (col. 19 lines 34-45) and displays image in dynamic image mode in a display section of said information terminal (col. 8 lines 39-

Art Unit: 4134

48; col. 16 lines 58-67; col. 17 lines 59-63; col. 28 lines 2-7 – video data from a time just prior to event detection (i.e. a predetermined time) is sent to the network).

Monroe fails to explicitly disclose distributing an image in response to a request. However, Onuma et al. disclose distributing an image in response to an operation of a user of an information terminal in a networked security system (Abstract; Paragraph 64).

As to claim 23, Monroe discloses an information terminal according to Claim 19, wherein said information terminal acquires the image in said predetermined time range from a data converter which reads the accumulated image from said accumulation unit and converts said image into a reduced image in response to a request and displays said image, frame by frame (col. 10 lines 13-15), in a display section of said information terminal (col. 8 lines 39-48; col. 16 lines 58-67; col. 17 lines 59-63; col. 28 lines 2-7 – video data from a time just prior to event detection (i.e. a predetermined time) is sent to the network).

Monroe fails to explicitly disclose distributing an image in response to a request. However, Onuma et al. disclose distributing an image in response to an operation of a user of an information terminal in a networked security system (Abstract; Paragraph 64).

As to claim 24, Monroe discloses an information terminal according to Claim 19, wherein said information terminal is one of a portable terminal and a client personal computer (PC) (Fig. 3; col. 17 lines 48-56 - PDA is used as an adjunct to base monitor station).

As to claim 25, Monroe discloses an information terminal according to claim 20, wherein said user is caused to input at least information for specifying said associated information terminal user (col. 23 lines 23-54 – portable video monitor has a fingerprint scanner that can be used for identification purposes) and an address of said notification unit (col. 3 lines 40-63 – the system preferably uses internet, which inherently requires that an address of the base monitor station be entered into the portable video monitor).

Monroe fails to disclose acting in response to selection of continued reproduction by said user. However, Onuma et al. disclose distributing an image in response to an operation of a user of an information terminal in a networked security system (Paragraph 64).

Monroe fails to disclose a field on the display for entering ID and address information. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use such a field on the screen of a PDA to prompt a user to enter information.

3. Claims 18 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe, US Patent No. 6,970,183, in view of Alexander et al. US Pub. No. 2002/0143938.

As to claim 18, Monroe discloses a video distribution method for a video distribution system connected to a communication network for distributing an image (Abstract; Fig. 2), comprising the steps of:

accumulating a video signal of at least one monitor area in an image accumulation and distribution unit through said network (Fig. 3; col. 17 line 59 – col. 18 line 15), wherein said video signal has attached thereto a channel number and a serial number constituting an Identification (ID) number unique to an imaging date and time and an image pickup unit that has picked up each frame of said image (col. 31 lines 11-16 - data is stamped with sensor identification (i.e. channel number); col. 6 line 62 – col. 7 line 4 - all collected data is stamped with a time or chronology signal (i.e. serial number));

reading said image for each of a plurality of channels from said image accumulation and distribution unit through said network (col. 17 line 48 – col. 18 line 11);

detecting an image change indicating an abnormality in an associated monitor area from said image read out (Fig. 34; col. 25 lines 59-64 – DSP 134 performs motion detection on image frames from camera 70), and producing alarm information (col. 17 lines 48-67) containing a change occurrence time (col. 6 line 62 – col. 7 line 4 - all collected data is stamped with a time or chronology signal) and a still image as of said change occurrence time (col. 10 lines 13-18 – data sent to monitors can be high-resolution still images);

transmitting said alarm information to an associated information terminal through said network and accumulating at least said change occurrence time and a channel number related to said change occurrence time as a number corresponding to said ID number as a first list in a notification unit (col. 30 lines 61-64 – server logs (i.e. lists) all information for later recall);

displaying said alarm information on said associated information terminal (col. 18 lines 50-61);

starting a video replay application or program by the user of said associated information terminal (col. 23 lines 23-35 – portable monitor contains an LCD screen which is capable of displaying video. All PDA units which display video must inherently start a video replay application to do so);

acquiring a reduced version of said image (col. 19 lines 34-45) in a predetermined time range (col. 28 lines 2-7 – video data from a time just prior to event detection (i.e. a predetermined time) is sent to the network) related to said change occurrence time from a data converter; and

displaying said reduced image in the display section of said information terminal (Fig. 3 44 is a PDA; col. 8 lines 34-50; col. 17 lines 48-56).

Monroe fails to disclose acquiring a list from a notification unit and generating a second list of an alarm generation time from said first list and displaying said second list on said information terminal and acquiring video in response to selection of a desired alarm generation time by the user. However, Alexander et al. disclose creating an event data log (i.e. list) in a server of a surveillance system, and sending this event data

log to a remote monitoring station, a PDA in this example, displaying this list on the PDA and allowing a user to select events from the list (Paragraph 75; Figure 10 – logs contain time, date, sensor ID, sensor location and links to video)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the logging system of Alexander with the surveillance system of Monroe. The motivation for this combination would have been to enable a user to “filter event data and also obtain greater detail” (Alexander Paragraph 75).

As to claim 26, Monroe discloses an information terminal according to Claim 25, wherein said notification unit stores unique information in a list in association with a serial number of a corresponding image frame each time of detection of image change (col. 31 lines 11-16 - data is stamped with sensor identification (i.e. channel number); col. 6 line 62 – col. 7 line 4 - all collected data is stamped with a time or chronology signal (i.e. serial number); col. 30 lines 61-64 – server logs (i.e. lists) all information for later recall),

Monroe fails to disclose displaying this list in said display section of said information terminal in such a way as to permit selection of arbitrary unique information, in response to the input of said user, specifying information and address of said notification unit. However, Alexander et al. disclose creating an event data log (i.e. list) in a server of a surveillance system, and sending this event data log to a remote monitoring station, a PDA in this example, displaying this list on the PDA and allowing a

user to select events from the list (Paragraph 75; Figure 10 – logs contain time, date, sensor ID, sensor location and links to video).

4. Claims 3, 11, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe, US Patent No. 6,970,183, in view of Onuma et al., Japan Pub. No. JP 2001167365, in further view of Ludtke et al. US Pub. No. 2002/0089517.

As to claims 3 and 11, Monroe discloses a video distribution system according to Claim 2, wherein said associated information terminal displays in a display section thereof said image in said predetermined time range (col. 15 lines 59-61 – video is routed to PDA monitor stations; Fig. 3: 44 is a PDA; Fig. 24 shows detail of PDA; col. 28 lines 2-7 – video data from a time just prior to event detection (i.e. a predetermined time) is sent to PDA)

Monroe fails to disclose a symbol indicating a present reproduction condition in response to selection of continued reproduction by said user. Ludtke et al. disclose on-screen words or symbols representing commands being executed by a VCR (Paragraph 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the on-screen display disclosed by Ludtke with the security system of Monroe and Onuma et al. The rationale for this combination would have been to inform a user of the current command being executed by the portable monitor PDA. All

Art Unit: 4134

the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As to claim 21, Monroe discloses an information terminal displays in the display section thereof said image in said predetermined time range (col. 28 lines 2-7 – video data from a time just prior to event detection (i.e. a predetermined time) is sent to the portable device). Monroe fails to disclose displaying a symbol indicating present reproduction condition and acting in response to user input.

Onuma et al. disclose prompting a user of a portable monitoring terminal to press a button to view an image of as of a change occurrence, and displaying this image (Paragraph 64). The user is then able to navigate through the images via symbols on a menu (Paragraph 64; Image 6: 53 is a navigation menu).

Ludtke et al. disclose on-screen words or symbols representing commands being executed by a VCR (Paragraph 8 – e.g. PLAY, STOP, REWIND, etc. buttons that are pressed by a user).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Onuma et al. with the security system of Monroe. The rationale for this combination would have been to await user input before sending video data. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in

their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

5. Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe, US Patent No. 6,970,183, in view of Onuma et al., Japan Pub. No. JP 2001167365, in view of Tachi, US Patent No. 4,232,347, and in further view of Alexander et al. US Pub. No 2002/0143938.

As to claims 8 and 16, Tachi discloses a video system, wherein a recording unit stores unique information (time stamps) in association with a serial number (individual frame numbers) of a corresponding image frame (col. 1 lines 48-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Tachi with the security system of Monroe and Onuma. The motivation for this combination would have been to uniquely identify each frame of video captured (Tachi col. 1 lines 52-54).

Alexander et al. disclose displaying a list of images corresponding to event detection in a display section of an information terminal in such a way as to permit selection of arbitrary unique information, detection time or channel number in response to the input of said user (Paragraph 75; Fig. 10 - user can select which event to view from a log displayed on a PDA. Logs contain time, date, sensor ID, sensor location and links to video).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the logging system of Alexander with the surveillance system of Monroe. The motivation for this combination would have been to enable a user to "filter event data and also obtain greater detail" (Alexander Paragraph 75).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT HANCE whose telephone number is (571)270-5319. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am - 5:00am EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derrick Ferris can be reached on (571) 272-3123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. H./

Application/Control Number: 10/820,031
Art Unit: 4134

Page 25

Examiner, Art Unit 4134

/Derrick W Ferris/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4134